

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over admitted prior art in view of Wada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,132,800). While not acquiescing in this rejection, claim 1 has been amended. The discussion below makes reference to amended claim 1.

Wada et al. discloses a video camera shown in Fig. 1. According to the office action, grip 3 (allegedly corresponding to the claimed hand strap fitting part) is located below a viewfinder 5.

First, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the position of hand strap fitting part 3 in Figures 4A-4C of the subject patent application based on the positional relationship between the viewfinder 5 and the grip 3 in Wada et al. In particular, viewfinder 5 and grip 3 of Wada et al. are respectively fitted to different sides of camera body 2 and grip 3 will never move into a field of view of viewfinder 5. See Wada et al., Figure 1; column 1 lines 19-21; and column 2, lines 17-21. At best, Wada et al. might perhaps have suggested modifying the Figure 4A-4C prior art to reposition the hand-strap fitting part 3 (or some other grip) on a different side of the device, but Wada et al. could never have taught or suggested how to position the hand-strap fitting part 3 on an identical surface on which a camera lens is located.

Second, claim 1 calls for a hand strap having, at one end thereof, a free-end portion that is swingable and, at another end thereof, a fixed, tied-end portion. As is clearly evident from drawings, grip 3 of Wada et al. is fixed to the camera body 2 at both ends thereof. See Wada et al., Figures 1-3. Therefore, the grip does not have a swingable, free-end portion. Wada et al. does not disclose a hand-strap as claimed and could not have provided any teaching whatsoever as to how to position such a hand strap.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the admitted prior art of Figures 4A-4C would never have been combined with Wada et al. so as to result in the subject matter of claims 1-3.

Moreover, claim 2 calls for the hand strap fitting part to be located in such a way that a swinging center of the hand strap comes below a horizontal line tangential to a bottom edge of the camera lens when the mobile apparatus is held for photographing in the upright position.

ARAKANE, T. et al.

Application No. 10/085,618

Response to Office Action dated June 15, 2006

The admitted prior art does not disclose such an arrangement. Inasmuch as Wada et al. discloses a grip fixed at both ends, Applicants submit that Wada et al. could not have possibly suggested that Figures 4A-4C be modified to provide such an arrangement.

The office action concludes that the proposed combination of Wada et al. and the admitted prior art would result in the subject matter of claim 2, but provides no explanation as to how this conclusion was reached. Should any rejection of claim 2 on this basis be maintained, Applicants respectfully request that an explanation be provided which demonstrates how the applied art can purportedly be combined to result in the subject matter of claim 2.

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:dbp

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100